The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. XI. ST. LOUIS, MO., APRIL 21, 1904. No. 16.

GROWING OPPOSITION TO THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS.

THE New York *Sun*, in its edition of March 6th, printed a communication from New Haven, Connecticut, which deserves to be reproduced here. It is as follows:

"Roman Catholics in Connecticut and generally throughout New England have been aroused the past week owing to a thinly veiled attack on the Knights of Columbus, which has appeared in the *Catholic Transcript*, the official organ of the Diocese of Hartford.

Importance is always attached to what the *Transcript* says on matters of this nature, because its policy is controlled by Bishop Tierney. A priest appointed by the Bishop is the editor, and at the head of the editorial page is a signed endorsement of the paper by the Bishop. It is also known that his interest in the paper is not of a perfunctory character.

The reference to the Knights of Columbus was worked into a leader in last week's issue, on the general subject of the Church's stand toward Freemasonry. A correspondent had asked for information on this point, and the editor gave it in a studious and carefully prepared editorial article of a column and a half. It is closing paragraphs were:

"The ends and means of Freemasonry, where it receives its full logical development, are evil. The society is condemned by name, and the Catholic who affiliates with it is, by that very act, excommunicated from his Church. There is no compromise between the two camps, no squinting allegiance. If you are a Freemason, you are no longer a Catholic, whatever your pretensions, and if you are a man, you should abide by the consequences of your own free and deliberate choice. Toward the end of his great encyclical on Freemasonry, Leo XIII. recommends the bishops of the Universal Church to organize and foster, as an offset to its

evil, Catholic guilds and confraternities. We have here in America societies established for this same end. But what is to be said of a Catholic organization which takes to its bosom and places in its seats of honor those who defy Bishop and Pontiff, laugh at the penalty of mere excommunication, and make friends with those whose ultimate aim is to overthrow and annihilate the religion of Christ? Does it require a prophet to foresee the final outcome of such a course?'

This is the most startling thing that has yet come from high Church circles regarding the Knights of Columbus. Although the order is not named in so many words, there are few who will not know what is meant, and for these the information can be given that it is the Knights of Columbus.

The reason for such an editorial article at this time is to be found in Bridgeport. Three weeks ago Patrick Coughlin, a well known citizen of Bridgeport, died. He was also a member of the Knights of Columbus, being one of the charter members of the local council. He posed as an Irishman and a Catholic, was mayor once, a candidate for sheriff at another time, and an assessor at the time of his death. All this time he was also a Mason, and he was buried, not with the Catholic mass, but with Masonic rites.

Now the constitution of the Knights of Columbus says distinctly that all members must be 'practical Catholics' and, of course, a man can not be a practical Catholic unless he receives Holy Communion at least once a year. No Mason in good standing could receive Holy Communion. Therefore, a man can not, according to the rules of the Knights, be a member of their order and also a Mason. Yet there are many other cases as notable as that of Patrick Coughlin. In Hartford there is a physician who is looked upon as one of the ruling spirits in the local Knights of Columbus Council, and he is also an active member of a lodge of Knights of Pythias, which, like the Masons, is put under the ban by the Catholic Church. There is a Stamford politician who has been for years influential in Republican circles, who boasts of being a Knight of Columbus, and who, according to common report about the State, is a Mason. It is notorious that he is not a practical Catholic in the sense in which that term is used in the constitution of the Knights of Columbus.

It is such cases as these—and many more might be cited—which have brought the order into disfavor with the Catholic Church in New England. In Connecticut disfavor is too mild a term to use, as the feeling now has almost reached the point of out-and-out antagonism.

The closing sentence in the *Transcript's* article, 'Does it require a prophet to foresee the final outcome of such a course?' is a clear

warning that the Church, at least here in Connecticut, expects a decided change of attitude on the part of the Knights, or else there will be an open rupture.

This state of affairs is of especial interest as the Knights of Columbus was founded in Connecticut. Its founder was the late Father McGivney of New Haven. It has spread out over the entire country now, and in some cities, especially New York, is strong. Certain tendencies, which are now causing open criticism, have long been looked upon with disfavor by the hierarchy. For instance, several years ago the fourth degree was evolved and was presented to the New England hierarchy for endorsement. Archbishop Williams, of Boston, Bishop Harkins of Providence, and Bishop Tierney of Hartford not only withheld their sanction of the degree, but pointed out to the officers that they were treading on dangerous ground when they were carrying their ritualism to such an extent.

Another instance of clerical disfavor was found at the last annual session of the National Council, when a determined effort was made to have a bishop accept the national chaplaincy. None would do so.

Further emphasis was given to the refusal because the Ancient Order of Hibernians has a bishop as national chaplain. The principal reason why the Knights have lost ecclesiastical favor is a prevailing opinion in high Church circles that their allegiance to the Church is more prated than real. The officers of the order say that if priests will point out members who are not practical Catholics, they will be dropped, but priests contend that they should not be called upon to do this, especially where infidelity to the Church on the part of members is notorious. It is said that in the Coughlin case in Bridgeport the local council will not pay over the death benefit, but this discipline after death is not just the kind that the Church is after.

There is already a movement among the Knights to prevent any rupture or further unpleasantness with the Church. The Church party, as it is called, has set on foot, in a quiet, unostentatious way, an effort to curb the tendencies which have brought the order into disfavor, and to bring about an active and impartial enforcement of the constitutional provisions regarding the dropping of members who are not practical Catholics."

* * *

The arcticle of the *Transcript* referred to in the above quotation appeared in that paper's issue of February 25th. We may add that it brought out an expression of unreserved endorsement and sympathy from the editor of the *Providence Visitor*, which is considered the official organ of the Bishop of Providence.

"At the risk of heaping coals of fire on our head," says the *Visitor*

(xxix, 23), "we must even go further than our contemporary and neighbor. We can not help confessing to our perfect inability to understand what reason there can be in a free country for that 'blanket of secrecy' under which even good and sound sodalities, reasonable guilds and confraternities are in the habit of pursuing their aims and ends. In no country have we witnessed so many secret societies. We are not ignorant of the fact that men are but grown-up children, and that a toy or a hobby is a natural thing for every man to have at every age of his life. Still there is no exaggeration in saying that those mysterious and secret methods are carried much too far in the United States. When a country is laboring and suffering under the yoke of an intolerable regime, and when no one is allowed, at the peril of his life, to express freely his discontent and his criticisms, then, of course, secret, underground and mysterious ways and means have to be resorted to by the friends of liberty, of free thought and free speech. That was the case in France, under Napoleon I; then between 1815 and 1830; and again under Napoleon III.; also in Germany, in Austria and in Italy at the same time, and even much later; in Russia, all the time. But on what grounds can these secret and childish ways be advocated in America, unless it be that these sodalities have aims that the most common sense of honor forbids them to disclose?"

* * *

There was a time—not very long ago—when THE REVIEW was the only Catholic journal in this country that dared to express such views. We are glad others are coming to the rescue. The Knights of Columbus is indeed a dangerous organization, and the sooner our Catholic editor see this and warn their readers against it, the better will it be for the cause of religion. The number of bishops who look with disfavor and alarm upon the spread of this society is continually increasing, and the time can not be far off when the "Knights" will either be condemned by the Church or compelled to abolish the objectionable features of their organization (as we pointed them out in detail over two years ago) and thereby lose their *raison d'être*, for they were organized for the sake of these objectionable features and will collapse when forced to do away with them.

We have stirred up considerable animosity by our repeated and blunt *exposés* of the workings of this semi-secret order, and a strong effort has been made to silence us by withdrawing subscriptions and patronage; but though we have lost a number of friends and subscribers, we shall continue, so long as we can wield a pen, to fight for what we conceive to be the cause of Catholic truth and discipline, against damnable innovations.

THE PROJECTED CATHOLIC DAILY AND THE "CHURCH PROGRESS."

Once before (vol. x, No. 33) we have devoted nearly seven pages to correcting the false notions entertained by the editor of the *Church Progress* of this city on the subject of a Catholic daily newspaper press. As that gentleman made no attempt to refute our arguments, we indulged the modest hope that we had convinced him and that, instead of continuing to emit inane objections, he would hail the advent of a pioneer Catholic daily as a blessing to the Catholic people of this country.

We regret to see that we have been mistaken. The other day (vol. xxvi, No. 52) the *Church Progress* published another editorial on the subject, calculated to discourage the nascent undertaking of our brethren in Buffalo, on which our readers are quite well informed.

We shall do as we did last summer: take up our contemporary's loose statements seriatim and show their utter hollowness and untenability.

1. "Many of our contemporaries," begins the *Church Progress*, "are giving extended notice to the announcement that we are soon to see the first English Catholic daily newspaper in America."

Such an announcement, even in the qualified form in which it has appeared,*) ought, it would seem, to fill every zealous Catholic with great joy and a lively desire to co-operate in an undertaking so timely, necessary, and commendable. The *Progress*, unfortunately, notices it only to throw upon it a stream of icy water.

2. "Buffalo, they say, is to be its home. Quite encouraging indeed. Most complimentary to the city that will give it birth."

From what follows the reader will see that this apparent praise is meant to be ironical.

3. "But why this positiveness of statement?"

There has been no undue "positiveness of statement" that we are aware of. THE REVIEW and other journals some time ago simply announced that the Catholics of Buffalo would start a Catholic daily newspaper *if they found sufficient support.* With this announcement was coupled a petition to all friends of the good cause, to aid in raising the necessary funds ($125,000).

4. "And what do they mean by soon?"

By *soon* they mean [see THE REVIEW, xi, pp. 150, 166, *et passim*]: January 1st, 1905, provided the sum of one hundred thousand dollars is then subscribed [ibid. p. 166].

5. "Perhaps we might also ask what they mean by a Catholic daily."

*) Cfr., e. g., THE REVIEW, xi, p. 148.

This question has been answered by the chief projector, Mr. James Gerard Smith, in various public circulars. [See THE REVIEW, vol. xi, 148 sq., 163 sq., and 177 sq.]

6. "Evidently our editorial friends base their announcements upon a circular similar to that which reached us some days ago."

All the *official* circulars ever issued in this matter have—we believe—been published in THE REVIEW, besides some personal communications from priests and laymen directly interested in the project (see THE REVIEW, pp. 66 and 178.) We do not know what circular the *Progress* refers to.

7. "But many of them could not have read more of it than the headline—A Catholic Daily to Be a Fact."

We suppose all of them, with the sole and solitary exception of the Homeric editor of the *Church Progress*, have read the papers in THE REVIEW, which gave an adequate conception of the project and the intentions of its promoters.

8. "Had they done so, they would have qualified their statements."

As the *Progress*, in its usual unscholarly way, does not indicate to which of its "editorial brethren" it refers, and what statements it considers needful of qualification, we are unable to guage the value of the above sentence. So far as THE REVIEW is concerned, we can truthfully say that our statements on the subject were duly "qualified," and we declare our readiness to stand by each and every one of them exactly as published.

9. "For they would have discovered that soon means when sufficient stock in the enterprise is subscribed and paid for."

Farther up (3) the *Progress* objected to the "positiveness of statement" of the promoters, and professed complete ignorance as to what they meant by *soon*. Here, it refutes its own allegation.

10. "They would also have learned that Catholic is synonymous with secular."

We have seen no circular in which such a synonymity was proclaimed. Will the *Progress* please give chapter and verse?

11. "Hence statement and fact are in conflict."

Which statement and which fact? We fear it is the *Progress'* own crude notions that are "in conflict." The Buffalo promoters know exactly what they want and have explained themselves quite clearly in the literature they have sent out.

12. "But as to the project itself: Assuming that this circular correctly forecasts the character of the contemplated publication, we fail to see why it should be announced as a Catholic daily."

Which circular? Does not common justice demand that, if you criticize a document, you first cite its authentic text, in order to enable year readers to see if your criticism is justified?

13. "It tells of an intention to publish a first-class, up-to-date, clean, politically independent, American, daily, penny paper 'with Catholic tendencies.'"

From this mangled quotation we judge that the circular referred to may be that issued by Mr. Smith last February and reprinted in THE REVIEW, No. 10, pp. 149 sq., though in that case the *Progress*' quotation is not entirely accurate. But let us take the quotation as it stands and listen to the rest of it:

14. "One which 'is to be a "secular paper," under Catholic auspices; not therefore a religious paper, as are most of our Catholic weeklies.'"

That seems reasonable enough and is entirely in harmony with the recommendation of the Fathers of the Third Plenary Council, who expressed the desire (decree 227) that "in quadam ex urbibus majoribus habeatur folium diuturnum, quod opibus, auctoritate scriptorumque ingenio et pondere folia profana adaequet;" adding that "*necesse non est, ut Catholicum nomen praeseferat. Sufficit ut*, praeter facta recentia et ea omnia, quae in ceteris foliis avide expetuntur, *religionem Catholicam, ubi propitia occasio se praebet, defendat ab hostium incursionibus et mendaciis, ejusque doctrinam exponat, praeterea totum id, quod scandalosum et lubricum est, sedulo a legentium oculis arceat.*" That is to say, a secular daily newspaper, which need not bear the Catholic name or a distinctively religious imprint, but, having a Catholic tendency, must be ever ready upon occasion to defend the Church, and ever careful to exclude from its columns that "vulgarity"—"debased theaters, impure literature and divorces"—which the *Church Progress*, in the same issue from which the article now under consideration is taken (xxvi, No. 52, p. 7, col. 7), deplores as a chief cause of the "marked increase in crime and criminal tendencies."

15. "Where, however, is its Catholicity"?

Why, in its Catholic tendency, to be sure! In its readiness to defend religion, and its constant and sedulous exclusion of anything and everything that would injure the Catholic faith or give scandal to Catholic readers.

16. "Tendencies are scarcely strong enough to deserve the honor, nor reliable enough to be depended upon to stand for what Catholicity implies."

A tendency, according to common acceptation, is a direction or course to any object or effect; "a casual or efficient influence to bring about an effect or result" (Webster.) What more do you require?

17. "We recognize them even in the yellow sheets of the day when self-interest attracts."

What do you "recognize" in the "yellow sheets of the day"? Tendencies? Yes; but surely not *Catholic* tendencies!

18. "We must have, therefore, something more substantial in the Catholic daily than Catholic tendencies."

What more can you expect from its management than an "efficient influence to bring about the effect or result" of defending the Catholic cause, eschewing vulgarity and obscenity, and instructing its readers in the truth? If the Fathers of the Council thought such a "tendency" sufficient, as they clearly did, why does the *Church Progress* demand more?

19. "Neither will a secular paper under Catholic auspices meet the requirement."

It may not "meet the requirement" of the *Church Progress*; but our above quotation from the 'Acta et Decreta' convincingly shows that it would not only meet the requirements, but correspond fully to the wishes and desires, of the Fathers of the Third Plenary Council, and therefore, presumably, of the present hierarchy of the United States.

20. "Catholic auspices in this connection is needful of definition."

The needful definition was supplied by Mr. Smith in his various, circular letters, reproduced in THE REVIEW, where he showed that the enterprise is to be undertaken by a number of highly respected Catholic laymen, who have proved themselves worthy of confidence by the publication, for thirty-six years, of a daily German newspaper of Catholic tendencies—with the approbation of Rt. Rev. Bishop Colton and the hearty and active support of a large proportion of the clergy of Buffalo. What better guarantees do you want?

21. "It might imply a Catholic editor-in-chief and a yellow journal management. It might mean something worse."

The promoters of this project have announced (cfr. THE REVIEW, vol. xi, p. 148): "We are authorized by the Rt. Rev. Charles Henry Colton, Bishop of Buffalo, to say that our enterprise has his most hearty approval and that our past record as publishers of the daily Buffalo *Volksfreund* gives him the most desirable reason for hoping and expecting that we shall never publish ought else than a morally clean and most commendable paper." Surely this can not mean "a yellow journal management" or "something worse." But even if the Bishop should be mistaken and the Volksfreund Company should belie their own record, a prompt withdrawal of Catholic patronage would most undoubtedly bring them back to their sober senses.

22. "Both kinds are on the market to-day, but no one thinks of calling them Catholic dailies."

We can not refute or comment this sentence, because we fail to grasp its meaning.

23. "Although assured that the 'near future' has this publication in store for us, the closing words of the circular hardly justify such expectation. For we are told that 'considering these things, we may reasonably expect that Catholics, whose circumstances permit, will readily subscribe to some stock of this Catholic newspaper. * * *'"

Indeed, if there were not more understanding of, nor zeal for, the Catholic cause among our good people, than is here displayed by the *Church Progress*, there would be no future whatever for any such venture, in spite of all the exhortations of the late Pope Leo XIII., of the urgent recommendation of the Fathers of the Third Plenary Council, and of the cry of thousands of enlightened and zealous bishops, priests, and laymen, such as the one who, in the same number of the *Church Progress*, denounces the secular daily press, as at present constituted and almost universally read by Catholics, as "one of the most potent, most ubiquitous, most constantly operative causes" of the "growing infidelity" and "marked increase in crime."

24. "As a business proposition, unlikely. As a charity, perhaps."

Why not as a "business proposition"? Mr. Smith has demonstrated [see THE REVIEW, xi, 11, pp. 163 sq.] that the prospects for a daily newspaper of Catholic tendency are quite favorable at present in the city of Buffalo. But leaving out business considerations altogether, and looking at the plan in the light of "a charity," why not interest ourselves in, and support it "as a charity"? Is not the cause of faith and good morals, so clearly involved in this matter, worthy of our best efforts and of any sacrifice we can possibly make?

25. "But nothing short of a multi-million endowment, it is feared, would keep it" [a Catholic daily, presumably] "alive."

We have previously [vol. x, No. 33], in a lengthy article against the same *Church Progress*, shown this latter assertion to be entirely erroneous. But even if it were well founded, would it not behoove a Catholic journal, instead of discouraging such a necessary and meritorious undertaking, rather to exhort the Catholic public to provide, if needful, even "a multi-million endowment" for the purpose of starting the first Catholic daily American newspaper in the language of the country, which, if successful, would surely prove the pioneer and fore-runner of others, thus redeeming our people from the bondage of the yellow press, which is a blight upon Catholicity in this country?

* * *

IS THE SINGLE TAX THEORY AN OPEN QUESTION?

II.

Leo XIII. and Individual Land Ownership.

In the first part of his Encyclical Rerum Novarum, of May 15th, 1891, Leo XIII. treats of the basis of private, and especially landed property. In order to ascertain the Pope's teaching without even a shadow of doubt, we shall offer a liberal translation of the papal document and in decisive passages add the Latin text. Some portions, however, of the text will be summarized, yet so as not to interrupt the connection or sequence of thought.

Having mentioned the plan of Socialists advocating the substitution of common for private ownership, as a remedy for social evils, the Pope declares the "this scheme, first, harms the working classes themselves; moreover is most unjust, since it does violence to lawful possessors; besides, perverts the functions of the State, and finally, produces universal confusion." The Pope then develops these four charges, one after the other.

In the first place he points out that "the immediate motive and direct purpose" of the workingman in his labor is "the acquisition of private property." Now if a man "with his earnings and savings," in order to better his condition and secure it for the future, buys some real estate, "that estate (praedium, fundus) is really and truly his, no less than was the money which he had earned by his labor," and generally speaking, there is no difference whatever between "the ownership of land and chattels." Would the scheme, therefore, which does away with private ownership, not exceedingly harm the working classes themselves, preventing them from using their earnings and savings as they please, to improve and ensure their position in life?

"Ergo si tenuitate sumptuum quicquam ipse comparsit fructumque parsimoniae suae, quo tutior esse custodia possit, in praedio collocavit, profecto praedium istiusmodi nihil est aliud, quam merces ipsa aliam induta speciem: propterea coemptus sic opifici fundus tam est in ejus potestate futurus, quam parta labore merces. Sed in hoc plane, ut facile intelligitur, rerum dominium vel moventium vel solidarum consistit."

The Pontiff next passes to the second and "graver charge, viz. the manifest injustice of the scheme, since the right of having private property is a right granted to man by nature."

"Verum, quod majus est, remedium proponunt cum justitia aperte pugnans, quia possidere res privatim ut suas, jus est homini a natura datum."

In two ways, private property, especially in land, can be shown to be a natural right.

Man is not, like the brute, guided merely by sensual instincts, but he is also endowed with reason, and "on that account he must be invested with the right of having exterior things not only for actual use, but as lasting and permanent property, and this not only in things which are consumed by their use, but also in such as remain even when they have been used."

"Ob hanc causam quod solum hoc animal est rationis particeps, bona homini tribuere necesse est non utenda solum, quod est omnium animantium commune, sed stabili perpetuoque jure possidenda, neque ea dumtaxat quae, nobis utentibus, permanent."

A deeper study of man's nature will make this clearer.

By his intelligence man embraces innumerable objects, and by his free will he chooses what he deems best suited to satisfy his various wants, not only for the present, but also for the future. "Hence it must be possible for him to acquire as property not only the fruits of the earth, but the very soil itself; for it is from the produce of the latter that he finds the necessaries of life for the future. Man's needs do not pass away; but return without ceasing; though satisfied to-day, they demand new supplies for to-morrow. Nature, therefore, must have given to man a stable and never-failing store-house, from which he may expect never-ending supplies. But such never-ending supplies nothing can afford except the earth with its abundance and fertility."

"Ex quo consequitur, ut in homine esse non modo terrenorum fructuum, sed ipsius terrae dominatum oporteat, quia e terrae fetu sibi res suppeditari videt ad futurum tempus necessarias. Habent cujusque hominis necessitates velut perpetuos reditus, ita ut hodie expletae, in crastinum nova imperent. Igitur rem quandam debet homini natura dedisse stabilem perpetuoque mansuram, unde perennitas subsidii expectari possit. Atqui istiusmodi perennitatem nulla res praestare, nisi cum ubertatibus suis terra, potest."

"Neither need we for this right apply to the State. Man is older than the State and consequently must, prior to the formation of any State, have possessed the right of providing for his subsistence."

"The fact, furthermore, that God has given the earth for the use and enjoyment of the whole human race, does not in the least prevent the existence of private possessions. For if it is said that God gave the earth to mankind in common, this is not to be understood as if he wanted the common ownership of the earth vested in all men, but because he did not assign to any one the possession of any particular portion of the earth, leaving the ac-

tual distribution of private possessions to men's industry and to the laws of peoples."

"Quod vero terram deus universo generi hominum utendam, fruendam dederit, id quidem non potest ullo pacto privatis possessionibus obesse. Deus enim generi hominum donavisse terram in commune dicitur, non quod ejus promiscuum apud omnes dominatum voluerit, sed quia partem nullam cuique assignavit possidendam, industriae hominum institutisque populorum permissâ privatarum possessionum descriptione."

(*To be continued.*)

BOOK REVIEWS AND LITERARY NOTES.

Lehrbuch des Katholischen Kirchenrechts. Von Dr. J. B. Sägmüller. In three parts: IV+834 pp. B. Herder, Freiburg and St. Louis. 1904. Price $4 net.

Professor Sägmüller of the University of Tübingen has done a great service to the Catholic clergy in writing this 'Lehrbuch.' If the well-known firm of B. Herder, who publish the work, would also give an English version, no doubt Dr. Sägmüller's text-book, with additions proper to the United States, would soon supplant Smith's 'Elements of Canon Law,' not only in our seminaries, but also in the general reading of pastors busy with parish affairs. Sägmüller's work consists of three volumes, bound in one; paper, type, arrangement are all excellent. The price for the work, four dollars, is very reasonable.

It is impossible in a few words to give an adequate criticism of the 'Lehrbuch,' but the scholarly method of the author is noticeable even in a cursory reading. The sources from which he draws his text are given at the heading of each chapter or section, and the wealth of foot-notes and references give ample opportunity for very extensive reading on each point treated.

The author, especially in the chapter on Church and State, quotes from the encyclicals of Leo XIII., and keeps in full accord with Roman doctrine. Following is a sample (page 62) of his exactness and conciseness: "The Catholic Church is dogmatically intolerant, but civilly tolerant."

On page 385, under the heading "Missions," an incomplete, in fact unsatisfactory, reference to the United States and missionary countries is given. In previous paragraphs the author had treated of parish priests, but he gives no hint, so far as a cursory reading shows, of the peculiar condition of rectors in the United States and in England, nor does he treat of that large body of

pastors who, like the clergy of the first ages of the Church, are pastors of souls and still are not called parish priests in the restricted sense of that term.

In the third part, on page 410, there is a good chapter on "The Church and the School," in which references are given also to the letters of Leo XIII. of August 1st, 1897, and December 8th, 1897, on the school question in the United States and in Canada.

On page 519, Dr. Sägmüller, under the marriage impediment of impotence, refers to the question whether *carentia ovariorum*, caused by a surgical operation, creates a diriment impediment. Against J. Antonelli and N. Casacca he holds there is no diriment impediment. When referring to the process for marriage cases, page 580, it may be added that an authentic interpretation of the instruction given to the United States in 1883, made by the Holy Office in 1903, declares that the marriage case is to be started, with few exceptions, in the diocese wherein the husband has a domicile.

Under "Canonical Trials," page 663 seq., American readers will not find the special code for the United States in criminal and disciplinary causes. This and other such matters no doubt will be supplied if the 'Lehrbuch' of Professor Sägmüller is translated into English. Designed specially for German countries, there was little need of inserting what is peculiar to English-speaking nations.

Withal the work of Dr. Sägmüller is quite clear, concise, and complete to the beginning of the pontificate of Pius X. The new code and the reforms of the reigning Pontiff will require additions to all works on Canon Law within the next five years.—P. A. B.

——*Vox Urbis* (vii, 3) contains a two-column account in classical Latin of the Iroquois Theatre fire in Chicago, by our friend Rev. P. Hilary Doswald, O. C. C.

——The *Messenger* publishes 'Dr. Harris, United States Commissioner of Education, and the Agnostic School House,' by Rev. Timothy Brosnahan, S. J. (Price, five cents.)

In an address delivered before the National Educational Association, Dr. Harris based his plea for the separation of religious from secular education on the principle that "the attitude of mind cultivated in secular instruction is unfitted for the approach to religious truths," and that the understanding trained by acquiring secular knowledge "is necessarily hostile and skeptical in its attitude towards religious truth." Father Brosnahan points out that, if this were really the case, public schools are simply hothouses of atheism. His brochure is an able criticism of Dr. Harris' arguments.

MINOR TOPICS.

The Y. M. C. A.—The *Katholischer Glaubensbote* of Louisville (xxxix, 7) says: "We hailed the establishment of the 'Young Men's Institute' years ago with joy, because we thought we had reason to hope that it would keep Catholic young men out of the Y. M. C. A. But it could flourish and bear fruit only where bishops and priests interested themselves in it; where no attention was paid to it, it was bound to decay, and many Catholic young men joined the Y. M. C. A."

To the Bishop of an Eastern Diocese we are indebted for the following:

"You have been asking for information about the Y. M. C. A., and not seeing you satisfied, I thought I would send you the enclosed documents....The paper clipping from the *Montreal Star* speaks for itself. *I can not see my way to give it* (the Y. M. C. A.) *any countenance. I have continually advised our young men to stay away and I have told the priests of the Diocese, when opportunity arose, to follow the same line of conduct*....Many see no particular danger in the Railway Y. M. C. A., for it simply gives young men a stopping place till time to take train or to take a bath or some ordinary sports...."

The enclosures were the by-laws of a local branch of the Y. M. C. A., which contain nothing particularly objectionable or dangerous to young Catholic men, but seem to exclude Catholics, in that they specify in section 3, that "any person....who is a member in good standing of an evangelical church shall be eligible to active membership." The clipping from the *Montreal Star* (of Jan. 22nd, 1904) contains an account of the opening, in that city, of the new building of the Railway Y. M. C. A., at which Rev. Father W. O'Meara, of St. Gabriel's Church, delivered an address, "expressing his gratification at the invitation to be present and his commendation of the work of the Association."

Rev. Father T. P. Schwam, of Wamego, Kansas, sends us a copy of the *Converted Catholic*, published by the apostate priest James A. O'Connor, from which it appears (vol. xvii, 1) that special efforts are made to have this pernicious periodical placed in the reading rooms of the Y. M. C. A., for the reason that "in every city and town in this country Roman Catholic young men attend the Y. M. C. A." Father Schwam informs us that this copy of the *Converted Catholic* was sent him by a member of the Association in Salt Lake, Utah, and gives it as his personal opinion that "the dangers of the Y. M. C. A. to Catholic youths have not been sufficiently appreciated."

The responses so far received to our recent enquiry would seem to indicate that, while there may be a few clergymen, and perhaps even the one or the other bishop, who view the Y. M. C. A. with favor and commend their work, the consensus among the clergy and hierarchy, and among educated Catholic laymen as well, appears to be that the Association is full of serious dangers to Catholic young men and ought to be avoided by them.

"Christian Socialism."—Rev. Dr. Joseph Selinger of St. Francis Seminary begs us to print the subjoined explanatory remarks in

reply to the criticism by Rev. Fr. Gettelmann, S. J., in our No. 14:

Socialism is the name of a creed, science, and theory of economics. The strictures put on the name by Rev. Gettelmann, S. J., in No. 14 of THE REVIEW, are quite to the point. The epithet *Christian* Socialism, however, which he considers a misnomer, is sometimes given, not to approve what is anti-Christian, but because action for reform in social conditions is taken in the very name of Christianity. The Church extends her care to all grades of society, "atque ad illos praecipue qui misera in fortuna versantur," according to the late Holy Father in his encyclical on Social Democracy. The very first point made in that encyclical concerns the name by which corporate action, "Ecclesiae auspiciis," is called. "Nulla quidem propria appellatione initio distingui consuevit: *Socialismi Christiani* nomen a nonnullis invectum et derivatum ab eo haud immerito obsoloverunt." Others, he continues, have called it "*actionem Christianem popularem.* Est etiam ubi, qui tali rei operam dant, *Sociales Christiani* vocantur." It is however the name Christian Democracy which, quia "aqud bonos plures offensionem habet, quippe cui ambiguum quiddam et periculosum adhaerescere existimant," he singles out for exposition.

Socialism being a technical term, should certainly be used as such,—but after it has been cleared and returned to its owners. My intention in the article alluded to was to urge an intelligent action against Socialism by a thorough understanding of both its sides—the commendable and damnable; at the same time to call attention to the necessity of appreciating the conditions and temper of our country and people. However Socialism in America is like Socialism in Europe: there is a difference of sympathy and prospect, in this country, which in a way modifies action against it. Not mere destruction, but construction as well, is wanted. We may look then with good hopes for such service by an adaptation of Father Cathrein's excellent revised book on Socialism.

Failure of State Schools in Australia.—The report of the commissioners selected to enquire into the system of national education in vogue in Australia and to compare it with those of other countries, has (we learn from the Sydney *Catholic Press* of January 21st) created a profound sensation. "The commissioners performed their duties frankly and honestly," says our esteemed contemporary, "and they have not hesitated to say that our State system is a complete failure, and years behind those of Europe. But this is not all. With exceptional courage the commissioners have gone even further, and have declared that in the future the State will not only find it necessary to reorganize all its teaching methods, but in the public interest will have to consider the advisability of subsidizing such private, municipal, and religious schools as will accept its curriculum and abide by its regulations. This conclusion was not based upon hearsay evidence, but was the logical outcome of their observations in countries where the principle of State subsidy is recognized. Under this system Mr. Knibbs, one of the commissioners, affirmed that the very best results were obtained, and the education standard lifted immeasurably. It is a system that gives more satisfaction to the people as a whole, whilst at the same time it produces a keen and healthy

spirit of competition between the schools, which leads to more highly qualified teaching staffs than even the government would demand."

More Free Parochial Schools.—Mr. James Preuss writes to us from Quincy, Ill.: As you mentioned in THE REVIEW that you intended to publish more about Catholic free schools, and as I heard of one in this city, I visited its pastor, Rev. M. Weiss, in order to get a few points about it. The school is that of St. Boniface parish, which claims the honor of erstwhile having had Rt. Rev. Bishop Janssen of Belleville as its pastor. Under the efficient guidance of Father Weiss the school is already for a number of months being conducted entirely free to pupils. Six sisters and one lay teacher form the teaching staff in the spacious and elegant four-story school-building. The chief support of the school is derived from one of the usual church collections each month, which is expressly stipulated for the purpose and on that account also nets a good bit more than the average collection. The pastor as well as the parishioners are well satisfied with the result of their undertaking.

Rev. Fr. Otto Jeron, O. M. Cap., informs us that the Sacred Heart parish at Yonkers, N. Y., has a free parochial school and that the congregation of Our Lady Queen of Angels, 227 E. 112th St., New York City, will make its parish school free this year. Both are in charge of Capuchin Fathers.

Another free parochial school that has been brought to our notice, is that of the Emmanuel congregation at Dayton, Ohio (Rev. Carl J. Hahne, pastor.) No tuition has been charged in this school since January 1st, 1900, and poor children receive even their books gratis.

——In the N. Y. *Evening Post* of April 4th we find a summary of the latest report of the Connecticut State Board of Health. It shows that the birth returns in Connecticut continue to indicate the slow but steady extinction of the purely native race, births from American parents falling in ten years from 8,487 to 8,283, while births from foreign and mixed parentage rise during the same time from 11,467 to 12,576. In a considerable number of the smaller farm towns the births from foreign or mixed parentage exceed the native births, suggesting the extent to which foreigners are taking up the farms in the back country towns. In one town, for example, almost purely a farm town, the births from native parentage in 1902 were 8 as compared with 16 of foreign or mixed parentage.

——At the request of the first Bishop of Baltimore, addressed to the S. Congregation of the Propaganda in 1794, His Holiness gave permission that the clause: "I will to the utmost of my power seek out and oppose heretics, schismatics, and the enemies of our Sovereign Lord and his successors," might be omitted in the oath to be taken by the newly appointed coadjutor Bishop Grässel. The reason Msgr. Carroll gave for his request was, that large numbers of sectarians would be present at the consecration to hear and misinterpret whatever they could, and that the clause of the oath aforesaid had already been misinterpreted, as though it implied hostility to the form of government established in the United States. (See the documents in Griffin's *Researches*, xxi, 2.)